**DOCKET NO.:** 303656.01 / MSFT-2787 **PATENT** 

**Application No.:** 10/718,951

Office Action Dated: March 20, 2007

#### REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-10, 12-29 and 31-38 will remain pending in this application. Claims 11 and 30 are hereby cancelled. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added in the above amendments.

The Drawings are objected to as including as including a reference character not mentioned in the specification. Claims 5 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,385,552 ("Snyder"). Applicants respectfully traverse all outstanding rejections.

## Interview Summary

Applicants' undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Isaac Tecklu participated in a telephonic interview on May 17, 2007 to discuss the present claim amendments. Agreement was reached, and Examiner Tecklu agreed to reevaluate rejections in light of the present claim amendments.

# **Drawings**

The Drawings are objected to as including as including a reference character not mentioned in the specification. Paragraph 49 of the specification is hereby amended to mention the subject reference character. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the drawings are respectfully requested.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 5 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 5 and 24 hereby amended to recite a device database with proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections are respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** 303656.01 / MSFT-2787 **PATENT** 

**Application No.:** 10/718,951

Office Action Dated: March 20, 2007

## Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,385,552 ("Snyder"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 1, 9, 20 and 28 recite a solution that includes a device database and a data project that is associated with the device database. At least one stored procedure is added to the data project. A request is received to build the solution, and, responsive to the request: each stored procedure in the data project is embedded into and registered with the device database. Thus, in response to a single request (*e.g.*, the request to build the solution) each stored procedure in the data project is embedded into and registered with the device database. Therefore, it is not necessary to manually embed and register each individual stored procedure with the device database.

Snyder discloses a test executive system that utilizes a test set database that holds state variables in non-volatile storage so the test stage can be restored in the event of a power cycle. Snyder further discloses that as *each individual* test is invoked, it can be registered with the test set database so it's progress can be tracked by other elements of the test executive system (Snyder, Col. 17, Il. 39-44). Thus, Snyder clearly requires the individual and manual invocation and registration of tests with the test set Database.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Snyder does not teach or suggest the following features from independent claims 1 and 20 (or corresponding features from independent claims 9 and 28):

associating the data project with the device database; adding the at least one stored procedure to the data project; receiving a request to build the solution, and, responsive to the request: embedding each stored procedure in the data project into the device database;

registering each stored procedure in the data project with the device database

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 20 and 28 are not anticipated by Snyder. Applicants further submit that claims 2-8, 10, 12-19, 21-27, 29 and 31-38 are patentable at least be reason of their dependency. Applicants note that claims 11

**DOCKET NO.:** 303656.01 / MSFT-2787 **PATENT** 

Application No.: 10/718,951
Office Action Dated: March 20, 2007

and 30 are hereby canceled. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** 303656.01 / MSFT-2787 **PATENT** 

**Application No.:** 10/718,951

Office Action Dated: March 20, 2007

# **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: June 20, 2007 /Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP Cira Centre 2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891 Telephone: (215) 568-3100

Facsimile: (215) 568-3439